

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner states that the inventions of Groups I and II are related as product and process of use under M.P.E.P. § 806.05(h) and that the method could be practiced with reagents other than those of Group II.

However, the Examiner has not set forth any examples of reagents other than those of Group II that could be used in the method of Group I. Therefore, the requirements of M.P.E.P. § 806.05(h) have not been met and it is requested that the claims of Groups I and II be rejoined and examined in the present application.

Further, if the claims of Group II are ultimately found allowable, it is requested that the claims of Group I be rejoined under M.P.E.P. § 821.04 and allowed in the present application, also.

Finally, Applicants traverse the Restriction Requirement on the grounds that thousands of U.S. patents have issued in which many more than two subclasses have been searched and the Patent and Trademark Office cannot reasonably assert that a burden exists in searching only two subclasses.

Accordingly, for the reasons presented above, it is submitted that the Patent and Trademark Office has failed to meet the burden necessary to sustain the Restriction Requirement. Withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
Norman F. Oblon

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Roland E. Martin  
Registration No. 48,082